



National Workshop on Development of a REDD+ Safeguards Information System in Myanmar

Workshop Report

Nay Pyi Taw, 29-30 January 2019

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations.....	3
1. Introduction	6
2. Workshop objectives	6
3. Workshop content and participation.....	6
4. Key discussion points and results	7
5. Next steps	9
Annex 1: Workshop agenda	10
Annex 2: List of participants	12
Annex 3: Group work results on relevant data sources and PLRs	14
Annex 4: Group work results on SIS design options.....	43
Annex 5: Summary of workshop survey results	48
Level of engagement in the REDD+ process.....	48
Effectiveness of the workshop and areas of improved knowledge as a result of the event	48
Overall satisfaction with the event and effectiveness of the methodologies used	49
Expected outcomes	49
Other comments	50

Acronyms and abbreviations

ACC	Anti-Corruption Commission
ALARM	Advancing Life And Regenerating Motherland
BANCA	Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Association
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBPA	Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CF	Community Forestry
CFI	Community Forestry Instructions
CHRO	Chin Human Rights Organization
CITES	Convention on Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna
CSO	Central Statistical Organisation
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DALMS	Department of Agricultural Land Management and Statistics
DEPP	Department of Electric Power and Planning
DoA	Department of Agriculture
DoM	Department of Mining
DRR	Disaster risk reduction
EAO	Ethnic Armed Organisation
ECD	Environmental Conservation Department
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FD	Forest Department
FFI	Fauna and Flora International
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FOW	Friends of Wildlife
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
FRA	Forest Resources Assessment
FREDA	Forest Resource Environment Development and Conservation Association
FRL	Forest Reference Level
GAD	General Administrative Department
GEN	Gender Equality Network
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIS	Geographical Information System
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
ICCA	Indigenous and community conserved area
IP/EN	Indigenous Peoples and Ethnic Nationalities
JMC	Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee
MATA	Myanmar Alliance for Transparency and Accountability
MCCSAP	Myanmar Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan
MCRB	Myanmar Centre for Responsible Business
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

MERN	Myanmar Environmental Rehabilitation-conservation Network
MFA	Myanmar Forest Association
MIC	Myanmar Investment Commission
MIMU	Myanmar Information Management Unit
MLCS	Myanmar Living Conditions Survey
MOALI	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation
MoEA	Ministry of Ethnic Affairs
MOEE	Ministry of Electricity and Energy
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MONREC	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation
MOPF	Ministry of Planning and Finance
MRRP	Myanmar Reforestation and Rehabilitation Programme
MSDP	Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan
MSWRR	Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NCA	National Ceasefire Agreement
NECCCC (NE5C)	National Environmental Conservation and Climate Change Central Committee
NFI	National Forest Inventory
NFMS	National Forest Monitoring System
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NLUP	National Land Use Plan
NWCD	Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division
NRPC	National Reconciliation and Peace Centre
PaMs	Policies and Measures
PFE	Permanent Forest Estate
PLRs	Policies, Laws and Regulations
POINT	Promotion of Indigenous and Nature Together
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation, plus the conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and the sustainable management of forests
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SIS	Safeguards Information System
SNC	Second National Communication
Sol	Summary of Information
SSID	Small-Scale Industries Department
TORs	Terms of Reference
TRD	Training and Research Department
TWG-SES	Technical Working Group on Stakeholder Engagement and Safeguards
UAGO	Union Attorney General's Office
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDRIP	UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNEP-WCMC	UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre

UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UN-REDD Programme	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
VFV Land	Vacant, Fallow and Virgin Land
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WFP	World Food Programme
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature
YCDC	Yangon City Development Committee

1. Introduction

Countries wishing to participate in REDD+ are requested by the UNFCCC to address and respect a set of seven social and environmental safeguards - commonly referred to as the Cancun Safeguards - throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities. By applying the safeguards, countries can enhance the positive impacts of REDD+ and prevent or mitigate any potential adverse impacts. In addition to addressing and respecting the safeguards, countries implementing REDD+ under the UNFCCC are required to: a) develop a system for providing information on how the Cancun safeguards are being addressed and respected, i.e. a Safeguards Information System (SIS); and b) provide summaries of information on how all the Cancun safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of REDD+ activities.

Myanmar is developing its country approach to safeguards and its SIS, with guidance from the Technical Working Group on Stakeholder Engagement and Safeguards (TWG-SES). A National Safeguards Roadmap identifying steps for the development of the national safeguards approach was prepared in 2017. Significant progress has been made in carrying out these steps, including: the assessment of potential social and environmental benefits and risks of REDD+; a review of safeguards relevant policies, laws and regulations; the development of a national safeguards clarification, setting out what the safeguards mean in the Myanmar national context; and an assessment of information needs for the SIS.

The National Workshop on Development of a REDD+ Safeguards Information System in Myanmar was held from 29-30 January 2019 in Nay Pyi Taw. It contributed to the SIS design process and helped to build participants' understanding of REDD+ safeguards, SIS and related concepts. This report provides an overview of the content and results of the workshop.

2. Workshop objectives

The objectives of the 'National Workshop on Development of a REDD+ Safeguards Information System in Myanmar' were to:

- Discuss the results of an assessment of information systems and sources relevant to the SIS.
- Collect feedback for filling gaps in the assessment and on other relevant sources of information for the SIS.
- Discuss possible approaches, barriers and opportunities for information collection and sharing.
- Discuss options for the design of the SIS, including institutional arrangements, information structure and modalities for public access to information.
- Update participants on process and requirements for the development of a Summary of Information on Safeguards (Sol).

3. Workshop content and participation

The workshop was held over two days and focused on the following topics:

1. Update on development of Myanmar's safeguards approach – work carried out so far and upcoming tasks, including Sol development
2. Presentation of results of the assessment of SIS-relevant information systems and sources, including documentation of relevant policies, laws and regulations (PLRs) and other procedures for addressing safeguards
3. Collection of feedback on relevant PLR documents and other data sources for the SIS (through group work)

4. Introduction to work carried out so far on SIS design
5. Collection of feedback on key issues and options for SIS design (through group work)
6. Next steps to be undertaken to finalize SIS design and develop Sol

Annex 1 shows the workshop agenda.

Over the two days, a total of 48 persons attended the workshop (23 women and 25 men), representing government, non-government and international organisations (see list of participants in Annex 2 for details).

4. Key discussion points and results

Many of the activities to develop Myanmar's national safeguards approach have been completed, including the elaboration of a national clarification that explains what the UNFCCC safeguards for REDD+ mean in the Myanmar national context. An important remaining area of work is the design and operationalization of the SIS, and the compilation of information for Myanmar's first Summary of Information (Sol) on safeguards. Participants at the workshop agreed that a drafting group should be formed to support the Sol development process, which is expected to be completed by the end of 2019 (see section 5 on next steps).

Discussions on the **results of the assessment of information systems and sources for the SIS** focussed on the identification of additional data sources and relevant PLRs. Participants initially worked in groups based on their area of expertise, and then had the opportunity to add comments and suggestions to the results of other groups through a museum visit of the flipchart notes they had produced. The topic areas of the four working groups were: forestry; biodiversity and environment; land use and livelihoods; and human rights and participation. The results of the group work on data sources and PLRs are presented in Annex 3.





Photos: Participants review results of the assessment of information systems and sources © UNEP-WCMC

The following key issues for SIS design were discussed at the workshop, through group work and a final plenary discussion:

- Institutional arrangements (which institutions should be involved, what roles should they play, how should they collaborate)
- The potential role of site-level information for the SIS (for which topics could information be collected at site level, how could this be organized, and how should the information be scaled up)
- Civil society involvement in SIS operation and the development of Sols (who should be involved, which functions of the SIS should they contribute to, and how)
- Possible stages in a phased approach to SIS development (what should be the priorities for a first and second stage of SIS operations)

Not all questions could be fully resolved during the discussions, given the complexity of the issues involved and the fact that many topics were being explored for the first time. However, some important points were emerging from the discussions:

- Key institutions for the SIS include MONREC (especially the Forest Department), the Central Statistical Organization, MOALI, GAD and MIMU; the hosting institution should be chosen from among this group
- Civil society should play a strong role in the SIS
- Many participants felt that a phased approach to SIS development would be appropriate in the Myanmar context
- The first phase of the SIS could focus on data held by a small number of key institutions, e.g. Forest Department, ECD, Central Statistical Organization, MOALI (Department of Agriculture)
- Participants expressed a preference for developing a public website during the first phase of the SIS, to facilitate awareness-raising and transparency

The full results of the group work on SIS design options are presented in Annex 4.

A **workshop satisfaction survey** was conducted at the end of the meeting to collect feedback and suggestions for the design of similar events to be held in the future (the results are summarised in Annex 5).

5. Next steps

During the final session of the workshop, the following **next steps** were discussed:

- Feedback from the workshop will be integrated into the assessment of information systems and sources and the SIS design report, which is expected to be finalised towards the end of 2019.
- The next workshop on the design of the SIS will be held in Q2.
- Work on the development of an operationalisation plan for the SIS will commence in Q2.
- A consultant will be hired to coordinate the work on a first complete draft of a Sol for Myanmar. He or she will be supported by a small drafting group composed of members of the TWG-SES, who will be invited to contribute information related to their area of expertise.
- The tentative date for completion of Myanmar's first draft Sol is end 2019.

Annex 1: Workshop agenda

Day 1 – 29 Jan		
Time	Session	Presenter/facilitator
8:30	Registration	
Session 1 : Welcome and Introduction		
9:00 – 9:15	Welcome remarks	TBC
9:15 – 9:25	Workshop agenda and expected outcomes	National Programme Manager
9:25 – 9:55	Recap on safeguards & SIS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Background and requirements - Myanmar's safeguards roadmap - SIS - SOI 	Cordula Epple, UNEP-WCMC
9:55 – 10:10	Q&A	
10:10 – 10:30	<i>Photo and Tea Break</i>	
Session 2: Information systems & sources for SIS		
10:30 – 10:40	Ice-breaker / introductions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce yourself to other people at your table. Each table should come up with one agreed answer to a question 	National Stakeholder Engagement Officer
10:40 – 11:10	Introduction to information systems and sources assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process and table - Highlights of information assessment results - key gaps 	National SIS Consultant
11:10 – 11:30	Considering information collection, quality and consolidation: technical knowledge and tips	National SIS Consultant + MIMU
11:30 – 11:40	Introduction to group work methodology/questions	National SIS Consultant + Cordula Epple
11:40 – 12:30	Group Work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Split into sector/topic based groups - Focus on criteria/questions where there are gaps in information - Consider risks related to information quality and collection 	Participants, group facilitators
12:30 – 1:30	<i>Lunch Break</i>	
1:30 – 3:15	Continue Group Work	Participants, group facilitators
3:15 – 3:30	<i>Tea Break</i>	
3:30 – 4:30	Report back from groups and discussion	Group rapporteurs
4:30 – 4:40	Announcement agenda for Day 2 and close for Day 1	National Programme Manager

Day 2 – 30 Jan		
Time	Session	Person In Charge
9:00 – 9:15	Recap from Day 1 and Overview of Day 2	Thinn Thitsar, FAO
9:15 – 9:30	Groups finalise work	Participants, group facilitators

9:30 – 10:30	Museum visit/carousel to review/add to the group work	Participants, group facilitators
10:30 – 10:45	<i>Tea Break</i>	
10:45 – 11:00	Any final questions on information assessment	National SIS Consultant + Cordula Epple
Session 4 : SIS issues and options		
11:00 – 11:20	Safeguards & SIS exercise	National SIS Consultant + Cordula Epple
11:20 – 11:45	SIS issues and options identified for Myanmar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recap SIS background - SIS issues and options - Two SIS examples (e.g. Vietnam & Sri Lanka) 	Cordula Epple
11:45 – 12:00	Q&A	
12:00 – 12:10	Introduction to group discussion questions: chance to add to/revise questions	Cordula Epple, participants
12:10 – 12:30	Start group work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Split into around 4 groups, each looking at a key issue & related options and making recommendations 	Participants, group facilitators
12:30 – 1:30	<i>Lunch Break</i>	
1:30 – 2:45	Continue group work	Participants, group facilitators
2:45 – 3:15	Report back from groups and discussion	Group rapporteurs
3:15 – 3:30	<i>Tea Break</i>	
3:30 – 4:00	Any final questions on SIS issues & options	Cordula Epple
4:00 – 4:15	Complete workshop survey	National SIS Consultant + Min Soe?
4:15 – 4:30	Next steps and closing remarks	TBC

Annex 2: List of participants

No.	Name	Gender		Organization	Attendance	
		M	F		29 Jan	30 Jan
1	U Aung Naing Linn	X		FOW	Y	Y
2	Mr. Timothy Boyle	X		UN-REDD	Y	Y
3	U Htoo Htoo Win	X		MOEA	Y	Y
4	Daw Aye Sandar Htun		X	Budget Department	Y	Y
5	Daw Thinn Thitsar Kyaw		X	FAO	Y	Y
6	Ms. Cordula Epple		X	UN Environment	Y	Y
7	U Kyaw Lwin	X		DALMS	Y	Y
8	Marn Yaw Han	X		IP/EN Network	Y	Y
9	Daw Ei Thinzar Aung		X	BANCA	Y	Y
10	U Saw Junip	X		IP/EN Network	Y	Y
11	Mai Thin Yu Mon		X	CHRO	Y	Y
12	U Lwin Moe Aung	X		FREDA	Y	Y
13	Daw Aye Win		X	UAGO	Y	Y
14	U Toe Aung	X		Forest Department	Y	
15	U Soe Paing	X		MFA	Y	Y
16	U Nyunt Win	X		Forest Department	Y	
17	U Thein Tun Hlaing	X		FAO	Y	Y
18	Daw Sandar Win Shwe		X	MOFA	Y	Y
19	U Stony	X		POINT	Y	Y
20	U Ngwe Thee	X		Forest Department	Y	Y
21	Moses Htun	X		CHRO	Y	Y
22	Daw Khin May Win Kyaw		X	Department Of Social Welfare	Y	Y
23	Daw Hnin Hnin Han		X	Central Statistical Organization	Y	Y
24	U Yan Moe Aung	X		Central Statistical Organization	Y	Y
25	U Banyar Oo	X		MCRB	Y	Y
26	Daw Nyein Aye		X	SSID/MOALI	Y	Y
27	Daw Thuzar Win		X	MOEA	Y	Y
28	Daw Ni Ni Thin		X	Environmental Conservation Department	Y	
29	U Htay Hlaing	X		Survey Department	Y	Y
30	U Aung San Oo	X		General Administration Department	Y	Y
31	Daw Ei Ei Thein		X	MIMU	Y	
32	Dr. Wai Phyo Oo	X		Environmental Conservation Department	Y	Y
33	U Min Min Oo	X		Forest Department	Y	Y
34	Dr. Zar Chi Win		X	Forest Department	Y	Y
35	Daw Wint Wint Tun		X	Department of Fisheries	Y	Y
36	U Paing Htet Thu	X		MERN	Y	Y
37	Daw Su Su Hlaing		X	DEPP/ MOEE	Y	Y
38	Daw Moe Nwet Nwet Aung		X	MOPF	Y	Y

39	Daw Khin Yimon Hlaing		X	Forest Department	Y	Y
40	U Htin Zaw Latt	X		Central Statistical Organization	Y	Y
41	Daw Aye Win		X	UAGO	Y	Y
42	Nyein Chan Linn	X		UN-REDD	Y	Y
43	Daw Thit Thit Han		X	UN-REDD	Y	Y
44	Daw Phyo Pa Pa Han		X	UN-REDD	Y	Y
45	U Min Lwin	X		Planning Department, MOALI	Y	Y
46	Daw Khin Hnin Myint		X	UN-REDD	Y	Y
47	Daw Sandar Min Wai		X	UN-REDD	Y	Y
48	U Min Soe	X		UN-REDD	Y	Y

Annex 3: Group work results on relevant data sources and PLRs

Table 1: Potential sources of information / datasets related to the Cancun Safeguards

Principle A: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should complement or be consistent with the objectives of National Forest Programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements.				
Criterion	Type of information needed	Possible Source of Information	Questions about additional datasets	Suggestions for additional datasets, including their quality and accessibility and who manages them
Criterion A.1. REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be designed and implemented so that they are consistent with the objectives of relevant national policies and programmes, including those related to forestry, climate change, environmental management, land use, biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, sustainable development, human rights, workers' rights, transparency and gender equality.	Statistical information that can be used to assess the outcomes of REDD+ Policies and Measures implemented in Myanmar in relation to existing policy objectives on the topics listed below			
	Forestry (e.g. data on forest area, forest state, other topics?)	NFMS, NFI	Are there other forest related statistics that could help to assess contribution of REDD+ to forest policy objectives?	Forestry group: FRA (National reporting, Area of forest cover) FRL (CO ₂ emissions in CO ₂ tons per ha)
	Climate Change (e.g. if national documents on adaptation mention a role for forests, we may need information on the state of these forests; information on forest carbon stocks may be needed to assess contribution to objectives on mitigation)	NFMS	Are there other datasets that could help to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on climate change adaptation and/or mitigation? For example data on which forests are important for adaptation?	Forestry group: SNC (Second National Communication) (CO ₂ tons/ha) for GHG emissions, AFOLU sector MCCSAP (REDD+ integrated) Biodiversity and Environment group: One Map Myanmar Department of Meteorology and Hydrology Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement Ministry of Planning and Finance

	Environmental Management (e.g. data on quality of the environment or forest cover in environmentally sensitive areas)	Environmental monitoring - no specific sources or datasets identified yet	Are there any datasets that could help to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on environmental management? For example data on environmentally sensitive areas, monitoring data on environmental parameters?	
	Biodiversity Conservation (e.g. biodiversity monitoring data, data on forest cover in important areas for biodiversity)	Biodiversity monitoring data - no specific sources or datasets identified yet Data on important areas for biodiversity - for example protected areas, key biodiversity areas	Are there any datasets from biodiversity monitoring that could help to assess REDD+ impacts? Are there any maps of important areas for biodiversity? Are there any other datasets that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on biodiversity conservation?	Biodiversity and Environment group: WCS (e.g. Smart Tool), FFI, WWF. Forest Department. BANCA One Map Myanmar (Protected Area System) NBSAP is updated periodically Digital version of data from biodiversity projects might be possible to get for project period
	Land Use (e.g. contribution of REDD+ to recognition of land rights and customary land use)	Information on land tenure registration and recognition of land rights - no specific information sources identified yet	What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on land use, e.g. from the National Land Use Policy, the Land Law, the Farmland Law?	Land Use and Livelihoods group: DALMS (Farm Land)- Statistical year book (annually), exists in digital and paper-based form. Forest Department (Forest Land) - CF units Planning and Statistics Division NWCD There are customary land use laws of National Ethnic Groups. Human Rights and Participation group: Myanmar Statistical Yearbook Community Forest Area in Forest Management Plan

Disaster Risk Reduction (e.g. information on forest areas that have a function in disaster risk reduction)	Information on forests that are important for disaster risk reduction - no specific information sources identified yet	Is there information on forest areas that have a function in disaster risk reduction? Do national documents on disaster risk reduction mention a role for forests?	<p>Forestry group: Ministry of Relief and Resettlement (Vulnerability Assessment)</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Forest Department Myanmar Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction MSWRR (Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement) MRRP (Myanmar Reforestation and Rehabilitation Programme)</p>
Sustainable Development (e.g. data on incomes, employment, health; information on national priorities for development, e.g. certain areas)	Data on household incomes, employment, health -no specific information sources or datasets identified yet	<p>What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on sustainable development? What data is collected in socio-economic surveys/monitoring that could be used?</p> <p>What other datasets could be relevant?</p> <p>Does the Sustainable Development Plan identify areas of Myanmar that are most in need of development, or certain groups of the population whose welfare should be improved?</p>	<p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: Information should exist at the Ministry of Planning and Finance, from the Census, at GAD, at CSO, at the Ministry for Progress of Border Areas and National Races Development, at the Department of Population</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: Integrated Household Living Conditions Assessment (UNDP) Myanmar Living Conditions Survey (2018, World Bank) Annual Labour Force Survey (Yearly)</p>
Human Rights (e.g. information on cases of conflict over human rights, contribution of REDD+ to recognition of land rights)	No specific information sources or datasets identified yet	What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on human rights?	<p>Human Rights and Participation group: Food Security Working Group Land Core group</p>

	Worker's Rights	Data on working conditions - no specific information sources or datasets identified yet	What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on workers' rights?	Human Rights and Participation group: Myanmar Human Rights Commission Office Social Security Board, Mekong Region Land Governance Project
	Transparency (e.g. data on occurrence of corruption or mismanagement of funds)	No specific information sources or datasets identified yet	What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on transparency?	Forestry group: EITI Human Rights and Participation group: Anti-corruption Commission
	Mining	No specific information sources or datasets identified yet	Are there any policy objectives on mining to which REDD+ could contribute? If yes, are there datasets that could be relevant for assessing this contribution?	Forestry group: Need to review Mining Department policies Biodiversity and Environment group: Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (Forest Department is key) DOM (Access to data not easy) MOALI (Data may exist in digital or paper form)

	Fishery and Agriculture (e.g. data on productivity and sustainability in agriculture)	Agriculture monitoring - no specific information sources or datasets identified yet	What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to the objectives of national policies on agriculture?	<p>Forestry group: MOALI (Annual report, metric tons of agricultural products) DOA, DALMS, Fishery</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: DALMS (Providing data on fisheries and agriculture to Ministry of Planning and Finance/ Central Statistical Organisation, this is digital and updated yearly) Animal Census (last carried out in 2017) is national level information, updated periodically, paper-based</p> <p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: MOALI, Department of Planning, Central Statistical Organisation, Sustainable Agriculture Development Plan 2018</p>
	Gender Equality (e.g. information on the situation of women or women-headed households in relation to income, land ownership, employment)	Gender-disaggregated data on income, employment, land ownership - no specific information sources or datasets identified yet	What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on gender equality?	<p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: General Administration Department, Department of Social Welfare, Department of Labour, Department of Immigration, Department of Rural Development</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: MLCS (Myanmar Living Conditions Survey), Myanmar Statistical Yearbook ALARM reports GEN (gender equality network)</p>
Criterion A.2. REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be designed and implemented so that they are consistent with the objectives of	Information on the outcomes of REDD+ Policies and Measures implemented in Myanmar in relation to the objectives of the conventions, agreements and national policies listed below			<p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Ministry of Planning and Finance</p>

<p>relevant international conventions and agreements such as the CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC, CITES, the Ramsar Convention, CEDAW, UNDRIP, UN Convention against Corruption, as well as national strategies and plans for the implementation of these agreements.</p>	<p>UN Convention to Combat Desertification and National Action Plan (e.g. data on land degradation or areas at risk of degradation)</p>	<p>Monitoring of land degradation and desertification - no specific information sources or datasets identified yet</p> <p>Information on areas at risk of desertification and land degradation - no specific information sources or datasets identified yet</p>	<p>What data is being collected to monitor land degradation?</p> <p>Have areas at risk of desertification and land degradation been identified?</p> <p>Are there other relevant datasets that could be used to assess whether REDD+ contributes to combatting desertification?</p>	<p>Biodiversity and Environment group: MRRP Dry Zone Greening Department. Forest Department</p>
	<p>Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (e.g. data on illegal trade in endangered timber species)</p>	<p>Records from customs controls or other enforcement efforts - no specific information sources or datasets identified yet</p>	<p>What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to policy objectives on regulating trade in endangered species?</p>	<p>Forestry group: Nature & Wildlife Conservation Department (CITES related data) Problems (cases of illegal trade), data for timber species in CITES group I/2 and other timber species</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: FD/ WCS/ WWF/ FFI/ Ministry of Commerce, Department of Trade Department of Fishery CITES permitting data (Forest Department), Department of Fishery NWCD (Nature and Wildlife Conservation Department)</p>
	<p>Ramsar Convention (e.g. data on forest cover and status in Ramsar sites)</p>	<p>No specific information sources or datasets identified yet</p>	<p>What datasets exist that could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is contributing to the objectives of the Ramsar Convention?</p>	<p>Forestry group: NWCD (Area of Ramsar sites) Management information (Ramsar sites)</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: One Map Myanmar UNESCO Ministry of Planning and Finance</p>

				Forest Department (existing Protected Areas), MONREC
	UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People	No specific information sources or datasets identified yet	What kind of information is regularly collected on the situation of rights of indigenous people in Myanmar?	Human Rights and Participation group: Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Reports of Civil Society Organisations from the human rights sector Network for Human Rights Declaration in Myanmar

Principle B: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should support transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty.

Criterion	Type of information needed	Possible Source of Information	Questions about additional datasets	Suggestions for additional datasets, including their quality and accessibility and who manages them
B.2 Where possible, REDD+ Policies and Measures should include actions that strengthen transparency, accountability and rule of law in forest governance, including in relation to forestry operations, land use planning and management planning, awarding of concessions, and application of legal requirements such as EIA and SEA.	Information on achieved outcomes of REDD+ PaMs that aim to strengthen transparency, accountability and rule of law (e.g. trends in legal compliance of forestry operations, trends in coverage, quality and follow-up of EIAs and SEAs, etc.)	<p>Data on amount of illegal timber seized</p> <p>Data on fines issued</p> <p>Data on EIA implementation</p>	Are there any other datasets that could be used to assess improvements in forest governance achieved through REDD+? For example data on legal compliance in forestry operations, respecting requirements for forest management planning, etc.	<p>Forestry group: EITI (Forestry, Energy and Mines) Land use: One Map Myanmar</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: FLEGT/Interpol WWF/ WCS/ FFI Data on illegal timber seized (Forest Department), national level information</p> <p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: Illegal timber (Forest Department inspection) Local Courts ECD, EITI Reports</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: SEA reports from municipal governments (YCDC, government level committee) SEA report from Myanmar Railway MATA (Myanmar Alliance for Transparency and Accountability), CSOs' reports about known forest removal outside PFE, FLEGT Report, EITI report, Chin Human Rights Organisation</p>

Principle C: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be designed and implemented to respect the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities.

Criterion	Type of information needed	Possible Source of Information	Questions about additional datasets	Suggestions for additional datasets, including their quality and accessibility and who manages them
Criterion C.2. REDD+ Policies and Measures should take into account existing land uses and avoid negative impacts on vulnerable stakeholder groups without documented rights to use land and resources (such as communities with customary land tenure), and where possible should support the fair and transparent clarification of use rights, avoiding risks of elite capture.	Information on implementation and results of any PaMs specifically supporting clarification of use rights/land tenure (e.g. area for which land use certificates or other documentation have been issued, statistical and spatial data on vulnerable stakeholder groups (e.g. ethnic minorities) without documented rights to the use of land and its resources, as well as on stakeholders with clarified tenure and use rights)	Land tenure records held by MOALI and GAD - no specific datasets or information sources identified SDG reporting - no specific datasets identified	Are there any maps or statistics on the area for which land use certificates or other documentation of rights have been issued? Are there any maps or statistics about the distribution of vulnerable stakeholder groups (e.g. small ethnic groups, poor people)? What other datasets could be relevant to assess whether REDD+ is avoiding negative impacts on vulnerable stakeholders and supporting the clarification of use rights?	Land Use and Livelihoods Group: Form 7 (right to farm a plot of land) and 11 (right to use VFV land for industrial crops) - list should be available at Township Administration Unit Central Vacant, Fallow and Virgin Land Management Committee CF Unit Human Rights and Participation group: MIMU Vulnerability Report (township level 2010-2017 data) WFP Poverty Report (Food Security) Need to set criteria and indicators for assessing the data
Criterion C.3. REDD+ Policies and Measures should be designed and implemented with respect for the cultural heritage and customary practices of indigenous peoples and local communities.	Information on implementation and outcomes of identified policies, laws and regulations on cultural heritage and customary practices (e.g. trends in application of customary practices)	No specific datasets or information sources identified	Are there any regular surveys of cultural heritage and customary practices, or is there any monitoring of existing PLRs on cultural heritage or customary practices?	Human Rights and Participation group: Need to identify acceptable customary practices linked to existing PLRs, Ethnic Rights Protection Law (section 3)

Principle E: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that they do not lead to the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits

Criterion	Type of information needed	Possible Source of Information	Questions about additional datasets	Suggestions for additional datasets, including their quality and accessibility and who manages them
<p>Criterion E.1. Before REDD+ Policies and Measures that could have an impact on natural forests are implemented, the distribution of natural forests in the area covered by the PaM should be mapped reliably, with particular attention to forests outside of the permanent forest estate. No conversion of these forests to other land uses (including into plantations) should be allowed; risks of indirect conversion (e.g. through displacement of land use) should be minimized as far as possible.</p>	Information on distribution of natural forests (statistical/maps)	NFI/NFMS (in future)	What kind of information is already available on the distribution of different forest types? Is it updated regularly?	Forestry group: Not yet Biodiversity and Environment group: One Map Myanmar Forestry Department Information is national level
	Information on trends in natural forest cover/quality, particularly inside/around REDD+ areas if available	NFI/NFMS (in future)	What kind of information is available on forest quality? (E.g. degraded/not degraded)? Is it updated regularly? Will areas covered by REDD+ PaMs be mapped so that this information can be compared to trends in forest condition?	Biodiversity and Environment group: NFI data is national Level Information and updated every 5 years
	Data or qualitative information / assessment on the impact of PaMs on natural forest (i.e. is there any indication that direct or indirect conversion has taken place, and if yes, over what area)	NFI/NFMS (in future) Land cover/land use information	What kind of information is available that could be used to assess whether direct or indirect conversion of forest has taken place in an area? For example, will it be possible to identify which land use has caused the conversion, and whether this land use has been displaced into the forest by the REDD+ PaM?	

<p>Criterion E.4. Priority benefits to be supported through appropriate selection, design and implementation of REDD+ Policies and Measures include promoting the wellbeing of poor, vulnerable and/or marginalized groups, supporting gender equality, supporting social peace and stability, protecting areas of high value for biodiversity or ecosystem services (in particular conservation of soil and water resources), increasing habitat connectivity, reducing or reversing land degradation, reducing pollution, and building the capacity of government staff and local stakeholders (e.g. to implement / comply with existing laws, to participate in decision-making and to adopt sustainable land use practices).</p>	<p>Information on the outcomes of REDD+ related to the prioritised benefits (see rows below) at the national/subnational level, and/or at the level of individual PaMs</p>			
	<p>The wellbeing of poor, vulnerable and/or marginalized groups</p>	<p>No specific datasets or information sources identified</p>	<p>What kind of data exists that could be used to assess the impacts of REDD+ on the wellbeing of poor, vulnerable or marginalized groups? What data is there on the distribution and socio-economic situation of people who could be considered poor, vulnerable or marginalized? What kind of statistics exist that measure people's wellbeing?</p>	<p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: Census, World Food Programme, CSO, Ministry of Planning and Finance</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: Vulnerability report, thematic reports (on www.dop.gov.mm) (Department of Population)</p>
	<p>Social peace and stability</p>	<p>Police records</p>	<p>Is any other data available on occurrence of conflict? Are there relevant case databases? (Violent or non-violent conflict, grievances within communities, legal disputes over land use, records of complaints related to forest user groups, etc.)</p>	<p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: Legal Clinic Myanmar, Courts, Local CSOs who monitor social peace and stability, Department of Irrigation and Water Management, GAD, Department of Highways</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: Information held in township police stations Center for Diversity and National Harmony (NGO)</p>
	<p>Areas of high value for biodiversity or ecosystem services (in particular conservation of soil and water resources)</p>	<p>For biodiversity, see A1. For ecosystem services, no particular datasets or information sources identified</p>	<p>Are there any data/maps about areas of high value for ecosystem services (e.g. areas with sensitive soils, areas important for water regulation)?</p>	

	Habitat connectivity	No specific datasets or information sources identified	Are there any approaches for analyzing/assessing habitat connectivity? Is there data on habitat distribution that is updated regularly and could be used to assess habitat connectivity?	
	Pollution	Information held by ECD - no specific datasets or information sources identified	What kind of data is collected about pollution of water, soils or air?	Biodiversity and Environment group: ALARM (Advancing life and regenerating motherland) ECO-Lab Myanmar Yangon City Development Committee (YCDC) Information is available on a project basis
	Capacity of government staff and local stakeholders (e.g. to implement / comply with existing laws, to participate in decision-making and to adopt sustainable land use practices).	No specific datasets or information sources identified - possibly some reports on capacity-building initiatives, including by UN-REDD	What kind of information is or could be collected to assess relevant capacity of government staff (especially for implementation and enforcement of environmental regulations, land use planning, conducting participatory processes) and local stakeholders (e.g. understanding of REDD+, capacity to participate in planning, implementation and monitoring of REDD+)? e.g. are any surveys conducted of awareness and knowledge on relevant issues, is there any recording of qualifications obtained by government staff? If information does not exist yet, could it be collected in future and how?	Biodiversity and Environment group: WCS, FFI and FD SMART Training and GIS Database from Forestry Department Land Use and Livelihoods group: Forest Research Institute, GAD, Agricultural Research Department, Department of Highways Newsletters and information materials released by relevant ministry departments, information on consultation events organized by NGOs, awareness raising events held by some departments and relevant CSOs. Human Rights and Participation group: GAD Human Development Index (Yearly) 19 / 62 indicator, DoI website List of people who completed REDD+ trainings

Table 2: Policies, Laws and Regulations that are related to the Cancun Safeguards

Principle A: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should complement or be consistent with the objectives of National Forest Programmes and relevant International conventions and agreements.				
Criterion	Type of information needed	Relevant PLRs identified	Questions about additional PLRs	Comments on additional PLRs (please provide the name of the PLRs and why they are relevant)
Criterion A.1. REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be designed and implemented so that they are consistent with the objectives of relevant national policies and programmes, including those	Description of relevant objectives within national policies and programmes about the areas listed in the criteria (see below)			
	Forestry	National Forest Policy 1995	Is there an updated version of the policy? Are there other relevant policies/programmes?	Forestry group: Forest Law 2018, draft Biodiversity Rules, draft Forest Rules, CF Instruction 2016, CBPA Law 2018
	Environmental Management	Environmental Conservation Law 2012	Any other relevant PLRs?	Human Rights and Participation group: Strategic Environmental Assessment EIA procedure

related to forestry, climate change, environmental management, land use, biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, sustainable development, human rights, workers' rights, transparency and gender equality.	Land Use	<p>National Land Use Policy</p> <p>National Land Law (under development)</p> <p>Farmland Law 2012</p>	Any other relevant PLRs?	<p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: Vacant, Fallow and Virgin Land Law, Upper Myanmar (Burma) Land & Revenue Regulation, Lower Myanmar Town & Village Lands Act, Land Acquisition Act Land & Revenue Act Biodiversity Law Forest Policy 1995 Forest Law Agriculture Law (1989) Ethnic Rights Protection Law 2015</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: VFV Land Law, CFIC. Land Acquisition Law (revised) Forest Law (2018) Conservation of Biodiversity & Protected Areas Law</p>
	Biodiversity Conservation	Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018	Any other relevant PLRs? (Note that the CBD and NBSAP are listed under A.2)	
	Disaster Risk Reduction	Natural Disaster Management Law	Any other relevant PLRs?	<p>Human Rights and Participation group: Strategic Environmental Assessment EIA procedure, Contingency Plan (Department of Disaster Management, Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs) Myanmar Action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction (2017)</p>

	Sustainable Development	Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan 2018-2030	Any other relevant documents?	Land Use and Livelihoods group: Myanmar Action Plan on DRR Freshwater Fisheries Law 1990 Human Rights and Participation group: Link between SDGs and Myanmar Development Assistance Policy Development Assistance Coordination Unit National Comprehensive Development Plan
	Human Rights	Myanmar National Human Rights Commission Law Constitution	Any other relevant PLRs?	Human Rights and Participation group: Ethnic Rights Protection Law (2015)
	Worker's Rights	Number of labour-related laws	Which are the PLRs that could be most relevant to REDD+?	Human Rights and Participation group: Occupational Safety and Health Law (Draft) Labour Organisation Law (2011) Settlement of Labour Disputes Law (2012) Development of Employment & Skills Law (2013) Minimum Wages Law (2013) Payment of Wages Law (2016) Social Security Law (2012) Workmen Compensation Act (1931) Leave and Holiday Act (1951) Factories Act (1951)
	Transparency	None identified so far	Are there any relevant PLRs?	Forestry group: EITI, Land Use Policy also encourages transparency, One Map Myanmar website Human Rights and Participation group: There are no rules and regulations for Transparency

	Gender Equality	None identified - but see A2 (National Strategic Plan for Advancement of Women 2013-2022)	Any other relevant PLRs?	Human Rights and Participation group: National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women Women's Rights Protection Law (Draft)
	Mining	Myanmar Mining Law	Is this law relevant here?	
	Fishery and Agriculture	None identified so far	What are the most relevant PLRs whose objectives could be supported by REDD+?	Land Use and Livelihoods group: Biodiversity Law Law relating to the Fishing Rights of Foreign Fishing Vessels Biodiversity and Environment group: Agriculture Law 1989, Myanmar Fisheries Law 1990 Freshwater Fisheries Law 1991
Criterion A.2. REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be designed and implemented so that they are consistent with the objectives of relevant international conventions and agreements such as the CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC, CITES, the	Description of relevant objectives of international conventions and agreements, and (where available) of the national strategies and implementation plans for the conventions and agreements listed in Criterion A.2	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)		Biodiversity and Environment group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018
		National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan	Are there any other national (or subnational) strategies or planning documents for implementing the CBD?	Biodiversity and Environment group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018
		UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)		Biodiversity and Environment group: Forest Law 2018

Ramsar Convention, CEDAW, UNDRIP, UN Convention against Corruption, as well as national strategies and plans for the implementation of these agreements.		National Action Programme of Myanmar to Combat Desertification 2005	Are there any other national (or subnational) strategies or planning documents for implementing the UNCCD?	
		UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)		Biodiversity and Environment group: Environmental Conservation Law 2012
		Myanmar Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (MCCSAP) 2016–2030	Is there a National Adaptation Programme? Are there any other national (or subnational) strategies or planning documents for implementing the UNFCCC?	Forestry group: NAPA, and National Sustainable Development Plan NSAP (Mangroves for the Future) Adaptation and Mitigation Biodiversity and Environment group: Environmental Conservation Law 2012
		Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)	Is there a national strategy or plan for CITES?	Forestry group: CBD (NBSAP 2015-2020) Biodiversity and Environment group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018
		Ramsar Convention	Is there a national strategy or plan for the Ramsar Convention?	Biodiversity and Environment group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018, Environmental Conservation Law 2012, Forest Law 2018
		Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)		

		National Strategic Plan for Advancement of Women 2013-2022	Are there any other national (or subnational) strategies or planning documents for implementing CEDAW?	
		UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP)	Is there any national strategy or plan for UNDRIP?	
		UN Convention Against Corruption	Is there a national strategy or plan for the UN Convention against Corruption?	<p>Forestry group: Need to follow up about Anti-Corruption Commission</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Anti-Corruption Commission Law</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: ACC Law (draft), Anti-corruption Law (2013)</p>

Principle B: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should support transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty.

Criterion	Type of information needed	Relevant PLRs identified	Questions about additional PLRs	Comments on additional PLRs (please provide the name of the PLRs and why they are relevant)
Criterion B.1. REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be implemented in a transparent manner; this means that decisions relating to the selection and location of activities, the involvement of stakeholders and the distribution of benefits and burdens should be based on clear criteria and well documented, financial accountability should be ensured, and comprehensive information should be made available to stakeholders in appropriate form during planning and implementation.	Description of legal requirements/provisions related to transparency of decision-making and information sharing in the kind of activities that might be relevant to REDD+ PaMs (e.g. land use planning, community forestry, improving agricultural practices, building capacity for alternative livelihoods)	No PLRs identified so far	Are there relevant national and sub-national policies, laws and/or regulations relating to sharing of information?	Land Use and Livelihoods group: Myanmar National Finance and Planning Policy Yearly National Finance Law (ဘဏ္ဍာနှစ် အချိုးသားစီမံကိန်းဥပဒေ) Human Rights and Participation group: Procedures related to settlement of PFE Ethnic Rights Protection Law Biodiversity Law
	Description of processes put in place to ensure financial accountability in REDD+ activities, including relevant existing PLRs	No PLRs identified so far	What are existing PLRs to ensure financial accountability that are relevant to REDD+?	Forestry group: Not yet Human Rights and Participation group: Statistics Law (2018)

B.2 Where possible, REDD+ Policies and Measures should include actions that strengthen transparency, accountability and rule of law in forest governance, including in relation to forestry operations, land use planning and management planning, awarding of concessions, and application of legal requirements such as EIA and SEA.	Description of legal requirements or processes, if any, to ensure transparency on decisions relating to forest governance (e.g. forestry operations, management planning, awarding of concessions) and wider land use planning and environmental management (e.g. EIA/SEA)	No PLRs identified so far	What are the most relevant PLRs that support transparency on these issues?	<p>Forestry group: Need to check contents of EIA procedure related to transparency, ECD Laws, Forestry Law and Regulation (e.g. use of tender system for private plantations) There are MOALI laws within the land use sector Central Project Bank Instruction</p> <p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: EITI, MATA, CSOs' reports</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Need to do CF and WG network</p>
Criterion B.3. REDD+ Policies and Measures should strengthen coordination on policies and plans related to land use across sectors, between different levels of government and across borders / with EAOs, including by fully operationalizing existing coordination bodies, making sure that social and environmental objectives are given adequate weight in the process.	Information on national/subnational regulations and/or mechanisms for the coordination of sectors/stakeholders relevant to land use/REDD+	No PLRs identified so far	What are key mechanisms or regulations for cross-sectoral coordination?	<p>Forestry group: Land Committee, NECCCC and Coastal Management Committee work on cross sectoral coordination</p> <p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: There are some coordination meetings at Town, District and State level</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Instruction by Union Government</p>
			What are key mechanisms or regulations for coordination across levels of government?	<p>Forestry group: Horizontal and vertical organisation structure</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Instruction by Union Government, State or Region Government</p>

			What are key mechanisms or regulations for coordination across borders and with EAOs?	<p>Forestry group: NRPC (National Reconciliation and Peace Centre) - 1. JMC Union level, 2. JMC State level and 3. JMC Local level (Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committees), regional government policies and regulations</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Central Body for Peace</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: For EAOs, according to the NCA and rules of the peace process, these kinds of mechanisms should be implemented</p>
Criterion B.5. When REDD+ Policies and Measures are planned, availability of data and institutional/ stakeholder capacity for their effective implementation should be considered, and identified deficits should be addressed.	Information on any legal/policy provisions or plans/programmes for supporting stakeholder capacity to participate in processes relevant to REDD+	Capacity-building efforts by UN-REDD Programme	Are there any other existing programmes or PLRs that support capacity-building for stakeholders so that they can participate in REDD+ PaMs?	<p>Forestry group: There is information about capacity building for the existing rules and strategies</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: CF DOC Training Centre TRD (Training and Research Department)</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: Forest Policy 1995</p>

Principle C: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be designed and implemented to respect the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities.

Criterion	Type of information needed	Relevant PLRs identified	Questions about additional PLRs	Comments on additional PLRs (please provide the name of the PLRs and why they are relevant)
Criterion C.1. REDD+ Policies and Measures should avoid involuntary resettlement and respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to use land and resources.	Information on legal/policy provisions related to resettlement	Tenancy Act VFV Land Law Farmland Law	Which are the main policies or laws that address resettlement?	Forestry group: There is an editing process to the Law to avoid involuntary resettlement. EIA/SEA can be used to avoid displacement Biodiversity and Environment group: Tenancy Act is not relevant VFV Land Law and Farmland Law are under revision
	Information on the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities regarding the use of the land and its resources, and any legal/policy provisions that support respect for these rights in decisions on land use	VFVM Rules National Land Use Policy Land Law (draft)	Are there any laws or policies on the land use rights of indigenous people and local communities, in addition to the VFVM Rules, the National Land Use Policy and the draft Land Law? Are there any information sources on customary practices and procedures related to land use and resource rights?	Forestry group: Forest Law, CBPA Law Ethnic Rights Protection Law (2015) Land Use and Livelihoods group: Customary laws of respective indigenous communities EAO Land Policies

<p>Criterion C.2. REDD+ Policies and Measures should take into account existing land uses and avoid negative impacts on vulnerable stakeholder groups without documented rights to use land and resources (such as communities with customary land tenure), and where possible should support the fair and transparent clarification of use rights, avoiding risks of elite capture.</p>	<p>Information on policies and regulations related to documentation of rights to land and resources, and on customary tenure/customary land use, as well as any other processes for fair and transparent clarification of use rights</p>	<p>National Land Use Policy</p>	<p>Are there any other relevant PLRs on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - documentation of rights to land and resources - documentation of customary land tenure? <p>Are there any other relevant processes for the clarification of land use rights?</p>	<p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: Customary laws of respective indigenous communities</p>
	<p>Information on policies and regulations related to the consideration of 'existing land uses' in decisions on the allocation of land for different purposes (as far as they are relevant to REDD+, e.g. allocation of land for plantations, protected areas, community forestry, investment projects, customary land practices, etc.)</p>	<p>National Land Use Policy</p> <p>VFV Land Law</p>	<p>For which of the following processes are there existing policies or regulations that ask for consideration of 'existing land uses' before decisions are made: allocation of land for plantations, establishment of protected areas, community forestry, investment projects?</p> <p>Are there any other processes that could be part of REDD+ where existing land uses should be considered? If yes, are there PLRs on consideration of existing land uses referring to them?</p>	<p>Forestry group: Forest Law, CBPA Law (2018)</p> <p>Land Use and Livelihoods group: Customary laws of respective indigenous communities</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018 (allows to establish CF in the Buffer zone of Protected Areas) Forest Law (CFI, allows to establish CF)</p>

Criterion C.3. REDD+ Policies and Measures should be designed and implemented with respect for the cultural heritage and customary practices of indigenous peoples and local communities.	Information regarding policies, laws and regulations on locally accepted cultural heritage and customary practices	No PLRs identified so far	What are the most relevant policies, laws and regulations on cultural heritage and customary practices?	Human Rights and Participation group: Land Acquisition Law (Draft)
Criterion C.4. Where impacts on the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities cannot be avoided without compromising the success of a Policy or Measure, appropriate forms of compensation should be offered and agreed through meaningfully implemented processes of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).	Information on policy/legal requirements, if any, related to compensation, FPIC, etc., including obligations from international human rights agreements and corresponding national laws	Only FPIC guidelines, no legally binding requirements	Are there any policies or legal requirements for compensation of local stakeholders whose rights are being restricted? If yes, are there any records about their implementation (e.g. compensation paid)?	Biodiversity and Environment group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018 (recognizes ICCAs) Human Rights and Participation group: Forest Law 2018 Chin Hunting area Chin Special Division (Extension of Laws Act)
Criterion C.5. Where indigenous peoples and local communities contribute to the implementation of REDD+ Policies and Measures, they should be offered a fair share of the benefits.	Information on any policies, laws and regulations related to benefit sharing relevant to REDD+ (i.e. PLRs that foresee the provision of monetary or non-monetary benefits to stakeholders who manage land sustainably, e.g. through community-based natural resource management, co-management of protected areas, payment for ecosystem services (PES) approaches)	Community Forestry Instructions	Are there any other examples of policies/regulations where stakeholders already receive benefits for contributing to the conservation or management of natural resources?	Biodiversity and Environment group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law 2018

Criterion C.6. A functional Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) should be provided to address and resolve any concerns related to impacts of REDD+ Policies and Measures on the rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities.	Information on any existing relevant GRMs and/or related policies, laws and regulations on access to justice	No mechanisms identified so far	What are existing mechanisms for resolving stakeholder complaints, e.g. in relation to government decisions on land use and use of natural resources?	Forestry group: There is a procedure for handling complaints letters that are sent to the Myanmar President's Office
--	--	---------------------------------	---	---

Principle D: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be designed and implemented with the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities.

Criterion	Type of information needed	Relevant PLRs identified	Questions about additional PLRs	Comments on additional PLRs (please provide the name of the PLRs and why they are relevant)
Criterion D.1. The participation of stakeholders in planning and implementation of Policies and Measures should be actively sought, and stakeholder groups with low capacity to participate (such as women, poor people, small ethnic groups, groups without documented land rights) should be supported through appropriate arrangements (e.g. capacity-building, choice of suitable communication formats).	Information on legal requirements/provisions, if any, related to stakeholder participation in areas relevant to REDD+ , e.g. natural resource management, land use planning, EITI, FLEG	No PLRs identified so far.	Are there any legal requirements related to stakeholder participation in areas relevant to REDD+, e.g. natural resource management, forest management, land use planning?	Forestry group: Land Use Policy has provisions on stakeholder participation, Forest Rules and Regulation include provisions on stakeholder participation, FLEG has a multi stakeholder process Biodiversity and Environment group: MEITI (Myanmar Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative) Ongoing process to become a permanent member of FLEG Human Rights and Participation group: Ethnic Rights Protection Law and Rules

<p>Criterion D.3. Where stakeholders, in particular members of local communities, can play a meaningful role in the implementation and/or monitoring of Policies and Measures, they should be offered the opportunity to participate (this may entail a need for capacity-building and establishment of supportive mechanisms, networks, etc.).</p>	<p>Information on legal requirements or provisions, and/or programmes or schemes, that can support stakeholder participation in implementation of REDD+ (e.g. co-management of protected areas, community forestry schemes)</p>	<p>Community Forestry Instructions</p>	<p>Are there any other relevant PLRs?</p> <p>Are there any other examples of stakeholder participation in implementation of natural resource management (in addition to co-management of protected areas and community forestry)?</p>	<p>Forestry group: Forest Law (Joint Forest Management) (Private forest plantation) National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: REDD+ Roadmap and REDD+ Strategy</p> <p>Human Rights and Participation group: Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas Law (2018)</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Principle E: REDD+ Policies and Measures in Myanmar should be consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that they do not lead to the conversion of natural forests, but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services, and to enhance other social and environmental benefits

Criterion	Type of information needed	Relevant PLRs identified	Questions about additional PLRs	Comments on additional PLRs (please provide the name of the PLRs and why they are relevant)
Criterion E.1. Before REDD+ Policies and Measures that could have an impact on natural forests are implemented, the distribution of natural forests in the area covered by the PaM should be mapped reliably, with particular attention to forests outside of the permanent forest estate. No conversion of these forests to other land uses (including into plantations) should be allowed; risks of indirect conversion (e.g. through displacement of land use) should be minimized as far as possible.	Legal requirements or provisions, if any, related to:			
	Impact assessment/ mapping before implementation of measures related to land use/forest use (e.g. EIA procedure)	No PLRs identified so far - EIA procedure may not be applicable to most types of REDD+ Policies and Measures	What legal requirements exist for impact assessment before measures on land use/forest use are implemented? (EIA Regulation may not be applicable to all forest management measures, are there other relevant procedures, e.g. from Forest Rules?)	Forestry group: Not clear Biodiversity and Environment group: Myanmar Investment Law 2016 (Up to MIC/Myanmar Investment Commission decision) Human Rights and Participation group: EIA, procedures for environmental conservation
	Mapping/inventory of forest within and outside of the permanent forest estate	No PLRs identified so far	Are there any legal requirements that ask for mapping of forests within and outside of the permanent forest estate before measures on land use/forest use are implemented?	Forestry group: The Forest Law and Policy mention the need of resources assessment Biodiversity and Environment group: Directive issued under the Forest Law

	Conversion of forest to other land uses	No PLRs identified so far	What are the most important legal requirements related to conversion of forest to other land uses? (e.g. necessary approvals)	<p>Forestry group: The VFV Law/ Rule and Forest Law mention a need for permission from the relevant Ministry to carry out conversion.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Environment group: Myanmar Investment Law 2016 Agriculture Policy (Forest Law 2018 and VFV Rule) Urbanization Policy (Forest Law 2018 and VFV Rule)</p>
Criterion E.5. REDD+ Policies and Measures that involve land use or management planning should be supported by capacity-building and transparency measures to ensure that environmental and social objectives are appropriately considered and not neglected due to a lack of data, awareness or understanding or a competing interest in short-term economic benefit.	Description of capacity building and transparency needs related to PaMs that involve land use planning/management planning	No relevant studies identified so far	Are there any relevant studies that identify capacity needs for land use planning or management planning (e.g. forest management, protected area management)? Is there information on risks related to transparency in land use planning or management planning? Have any studies been undertaken in connection with development of the Land Law?	<p>Forestry group: There is no Land Law yet in Myanmar Land related issues are considered in small case studies / project-based case studies</p>

	Information on any existing policies, laws, initiatives or mechanisms that can help to meet those capacity and transparency needs	NLUP EITI OneMap MIMU Open Development Myanmar Anti-Corruption Commission	Are there any other existing policies, laws, initiatives or mechanisms that can help to build capacity for land use planning and management planning and ensure transparency of these processes? For example, initiatives to improve the availability of data, increase knowledge and awareness on environmental and social considerations, and address corruption risk	Forestry group: Ok
--	---	--	---	--------------------

Annex 4: Group work results on SIS design options

Group 1: Institutional arrangements for the SIS

- Which institutions (national and/or subnational) could play a role in the SIS? Answer this question by identifying:
 - The institutions that are most likely to provide substantial inputs of data and information for the SIS, based on the outcomes of the previous round of group work
 - The institutions with technical capacities for hosting databases and information (existing or under development)
 - The institutions that have relevant mandates in relation to REDD+ implementation and/or reporting (e.g. submission of Summaries of Information on safeguards to UNFCCC)

Answer: The following ministries or organizations should play a role in the SIS:

As a first priority, MONREC (Forest Department) should play a main role in the SIS because of the percentage of data the department is most likely to have, and because it is an institution that has relevant mandates in relation to REDD+ implementation and reporting.

Then Central Statistical Organization, MOALI, GAD and MIMU.

(Proposed to choose hosting institution from among these.)

- How could these institutions collaborate to cover all of the key functions of a SIS (information collection, analysis, quality assurance, validation, dissemination, production of Summaries of Information)? How could conflicts of interest be prevented? (E.g. if the same institutions are responsible both for PaMs implementation and for the collection, analysis and reporting of information on safeguards). If possible, draw a diagram that shows the different responsibilities and indicates flows of information.

Answer: To get good quality data we should think about the following factors:

1. Budget
2. Database System (data structure, storage method, sharing method)
3. Technical/Staff Capacity (data analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation of SIS)
4. Data Maintenance (procedure for maintaining the data)
5. Risks and Requirements (risk management plan and specification of requirements for SIS development/implementation)

- What are possible challenges that could prevent institutions from collaborating on the SIS? How could they be overcome?

Answer: The possible challenges are:

1. Capacity in terms of availability of human resources with relevant technical skills
2. Methodology (need to choose the right methodology for data collection to get good quality and timely information)
3. Standardization (need to specify information requests in a user friendly way, same standard for different sectors)
4. Coordination / Cooperation (there will be a need for mandates and authority for coordination, support from some high level authority will be needed to develop the agreements for sharing of information)

Group 2: Potential role of site-level information for the SIS

- Discussion Question 1: Out of the topics for which data gaps have been identified, for which topics would information collected on the ground in REDD+ implementation areas be particularly useful?

List of identified topics for which site-level information could be relevant:

Socio-economic data, land tenure information, demographic data, information on policies, land use change data, environmental data.

Other discussion points that arose in this context:

1. To close the identified information gaps, there is also a need to contact other line ministries (networking between ministries to coordinate on resource conservation)
 2. Information on illegal logging is relevant and should be made accessible for the SIS
 3. Some information should also come from region/state level, e.g. about regional development plans (dams, hydro power, industrial zones, agriculture -> key available from Department of Planning)
 4. The Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan is important (need to make links between MSDP and REDD+)
 5. Ground-level data will be available for REDD+ activities
- Who could collect such information? (Consider technical capacity as well as practical feasibility/availability of funding – could information collection be combined with other tasks?)
 1. Important to set up a working committee or task force at national level to check information availability and obtain high-level support for information sharing; need to identify members and develop terms of reference. (Technical inputs should be provided by CSOs/NGOs and staff from the relevant ministries represented on the group; institutions should be given official instructions for the collaboration)
 2. Need cooperation with regional governments for getting information.
 3. Budget for supporting SIS activities should come from regional development funds, international and national donors.
 4. The Forest and Forest Products Federation can play a role in the SIS. They should be approached because:
 - ✓ They represent other relevant persons who would like to invest in the forest area (private enterprise and associations)
 - ✓ We can get additional effective thinking and help from them.
 - ✓ We need to implement the SIS in an inclusive manner for it to be effective.
 - Would this be possible for all types of REDD+ PaMs? For example, would national-level PaMs (such as the development of new regulations under the Forest Law) need to be treated differently?
 1. The Environmental Accounting System, if established, could provide relevant information for national-level PaMs
 2. Site-level information cannot be collected for all types of PaMs
 3. Different safeguards issues may be important in different PaMs.
 - How could site-level information be aggregated in the national-level SIS? (E.g. could indicators be standardized, could information from sample sites be extrapolated?)

1. Data collection should be done step by step, starting from the ground level such as village, township, district level (i.e. sub-regional) up to the regional level, where data will be compiled.
2. Experts should develop a standardized format for data collection to support harmonization of data.
3. Data should initially be collected at pilot sites where there is potential to collect the required data. Based on the pilot site data, extrapolation can be done.

Group 3: Potential role of civil society in the operation of the SIS and development of Summaries of Information (Sol)

- What are the possible opportunities and challenges for involving civil society in the following aspects of the SIS and Sol development?
 - Information collection / monitoring
 - Quality control and validation of information
 - Analysis and interpretation of information
 - Review of reports (e.g. Sol)
 - ✓ Answer: There will be a need to define which organizations will be counted as CSOs / involved in the CSO role
 - ✓ CSOs can support information collection in their areas of expertise / project areas (e.g. at township level and state level)
 - ✓ There are challenges linked to government data and information, e.g. in terms of data format (paper-based or digital - update of information via web link will not be possible in all cases), and for some information long request procedures are needed.
 - ✓ CSOs need to have specific rights with regard to the analysis and interpretation of information.
- Could civil society involvement contribute to preventing conflicts of interest if the same institutions are responsible both for PaMs implementation and for the collection, analysis and reporting of information on safeguards?
 - ✓ In order to be able to prevent conflict, civil society roles would need to be strengthened; typically, involvement is just in a role of facilitation/providing a platform
- What could civil society involvement in the different aspects of the SIS look like? (Who could do what, when, how?)
 - ✓ Firstly, there should be a classification of the proposed SIS content based on sectors/topics, and relevant organisations should be identified for each section
 - ✓ MERN could play a role (it represents 28 NGOs)
 - ✓ The Food Security Working Group might also be relevant (includes almost 100 NGOs)
 - ✓ Ethnically Based NGOs should be involved
- Are there existing experiences/processes that could be drawn upon? How are these processes currently organized and funded?
 - ✓ The role of CSOs in SIS/SOI development at all levels should be officially recognized, and their representation should be 50%
 - ✓ All stakeholder groups should have a voice, need to make sure that CSOs are selected so that all groups are represented (e.g. different ethnic groups)

Group 4: Possible stages in a phased approach to SIS development

- If Myanmar was to develop its SIS in several stages, what would you see as minimum requirements for stage 1? E.g.,
 - Should the first priority be to clarify how safeguards will be addressed and to enter this kind of narrative information into the SIS, or should an effort be made to already start collecting datasets for reporting on REDD+ outcomes ('respecting safeguards')? What could be the advantages or disadvantages of either solution?
 - Are there particular safeguards criteria on which information should be collected as a priority? If yes, why?
 - Are there institutions whose data holdings should be integrated into the SIS first? If yes, why?
 - Should a public web interface for the SIS be developed during the first stage? If not, how should information be made available to the public?
 - Should the first stage of the SIS aim to incorporate information that will be required for particular donors/funding mechanisms who might fund REDD+ actions in the foreseeable future? If yes, which?

1. Answer: At first the clarification of safeguards should be used for the SIS, and effort should also be focussed on integrating existing data sets.

Benefits and strengths of this approach: data can be standardized, an overview of the situation can be provided fast, it will be possible to get public support for REDD+, can fulfill the requirements of donors where information is relevant to specific projects

Weaknesses: some more time will be needed to integrate data, need agreement from all stakeholders, information may not be available to match all donor requirements

2. Priority among the safeguards topics/criteria :
 - Integrated Land use Planning
 - Forest conversion, development of community forestry, income from community forestry
 - FPIC to ensure sustainable land use management

By focusing on these criteria initially, policy makers/researchers will be able to achieve good results, and support sustainable development.

3. Data held by the following institutions should be integrated into the SIS first: Forest Department, Central Statistical Organization, MOALI, Department of Agriculture, ECD, Land Use Council. These institutions can provide official data and are widely recognized as key players.
 4. A public website should be developed during the first phase.
This will be good for raising awareness, and allow improvement of the information by obtaining feedback from the public.
 5. Incorporating information required by particular potential donors/funding mechanisms.
Yes, the SIS should consider the requirements of donors funding community-based forest management, biodiversity conservation, mangrove rehabilitation and fuelwood substitution.
- What kind of improvements to SIS content and functionality should be made during a second stage (e.g. over the next 2-3 years)?

Answer: Improvements to SIS content and functionality in the second stage should include:

- Clearly assigning contact persons for relevant focal departments providing information to the SIS.
- Setting up clear procedures and TORs describing the role of relevant focal departments in the SIS.
- Getting commitment from the relevant focal departments.
- Forming a SIS working group to develop clear criteria for strong and valid data to be used in the SIS.

There should be a quality control / M&E system for the SIS.

Annex 5: Summary of workshop survey results

26 participants filled in the workshop survey. The survey was structured in four parts, Basic information, Knowledge, Methodology and Event Assessment, and Expected Outcomes. Each part included a number of questions. Below are the main results.

Level of engagement in the REDD+ process

24 of the 26 respondents stated that they occasionally participate in meetings and events related to the REDD+ process, 1 respondent stated to be involved in decision-making processes on REDD+, and 1 respondent did not answer the question.

Effectiveness of the workshop and areas of improved knowledge as a result of the event

92% of respondents said that the workshop had been moderately effective in increasing their knowledge for the advancement of REDD+ in Myanmar. 1 respondent said it had been very effective, while another respondent did not answer the question.

The table below shows the participants' evaluation of the degree to which their knowledge had improved on the different topics. The greatest knowledge gains were reported on the topic of Safeguard Information Systems, with 69% of participants stating their knowledge had improved moderately, and 23% stating there had been high improvement. The lowest scores were achieved on the topic of data management and collection, with 15% of participants stating there had been high improvement in their knowledge, and 54% of participants reporting a moderate improvement, while another 15% felt that their knowledge hadn't improved.

Topics	No improvement	Moderate improvement	High improvement
Understanding the UNFCCC safeguards requirements	4% (1)	69% (18)	15% (4)
REDD+ / Cancun Safeguards	8% (2)	61% (16)	19% (5)
Safeguard Information System (SIS)	4% (1)	69% (18)	23% (6)
Data management / collection	15% (4)	54% (14)	15% (4)

The participants were also asked to rate their level of agreement with a number of statements as to how useful they had found the event. Three of the statements showed a level of agreement of more than 80% among the respondents: 21 participants each said that they would find it useful to share the knowledge gained with colleagues, that they would participate again in a similar event, and that they would recommend this type of event to colleagues or partners. The level of agreement was lowest on the question whether participants would apply their new knowledge, with 46% of participants expecting to do this, and 50% feeling unsure / giving a neutral answer.

Statement	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
My knowledge on REDD+ SIS improved	12% (3)	19% (5)	69% (18)
I will use what I learned during the event	4% (1)	50% (13)	46% (12)

The knowledge I gained will be useful to share with colleagues in my organization	11% (3)	8% (2)	81% (21)
I would participate again in similar workshops / events	8% (2)	11% (3)	81% (21)
I would recommend colleagues or partners in the country to attend a similar event	11% (3)	8% (2)	81% (21)

Overall satisfaction with the event and effectiveness of the methodologies used

The majority (85%) of the respondents were moderately satisfied with the event, and 15% were very satisfied. No participants said they were dissatisfied.

All the methodologies utilized during the event were found effective by a majority of the respondents. Particularly high ratings were given to learning from the experience of other participants (81%) and group work / learning from technical experts/presentations (77% each). All the results are shown in the table below.

Methodology	Ineffective	Neutral	Effective
Learning from technical experts, presentations	-	15% (4)	77% (20)
Learning from other participants	4% (1)	7% (2)	81% (21)
Networking with other participants	-	19% (5)	73% (19)
Contributing own expertise/ experiences	-	19% (5)	65% (17)
Group work		15% (4)	77% (20)

When asked which of the methodologies should be given more room in future events, 10 respondents (37%) suggested to have more lectures and presentations, and 8 respondents (30%) voted in favour of having more group exercises. 19% (five participants) felt that there was a good balance among the methodologies used. Below are the full results.

Methodology to prioritised in future events	% of respondents (N. of respondents)
Lectures/Presentations	37% (10)
Group exercises	30% (8)
Discussions	4% (1)
None, the balance was good	19% (5)

Expected outcomes

Most of the respondents to the survey stated that they would share the knowledge gained during the event with others, in particular with stakeholders at the local level (33%), with colleagues or senior staff within their own organization (19%) and with Technical REDD+ practitioners (15%).

Technical REDD+ practitioners	15% (4)
Local level/national stakeholders	33% (9)
Colleagues or supervisors / senior management within own organization	19% (5)
Academic experts	7% (2)
Policy experts	7% (2)
Government decision makers	7% (2)

Other comments

Additional comments received from participants addressed a variety of topics, including:

- Raising the level of participation from civil society organizations, local-level representatives and ethnic groups
- Ensuring good quality translation into Myanmar language
- Making the group work questions more specific
- Forming regional task force groups for SIS
- Ensuring respect for the rights of ethnic groups in REDD+ implementation.